REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 through 17 are pending and have been examined. The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) as having failed to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Claims 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, and 14 through 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent Publication No. 06-132837 ("Oki"). Claims 5, 6, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oki in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,390,340 ("Kondo"). Claim 7 was allowed. Claims 4, 10 and 13 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but the Examiner asserted that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

The Applicant has amended claims 8 and 16. The previous scope of claims 8 and 16 has not been narrowed by this amendment, but has, in fact, been broadened in certain respects. Exhibit A, captioned "Version with markings to show changes made," attached hereto, shows the changes that were made to the claims.

For the reasons set forth below, the Applicants request reconsideration of the claim rejections.

I.   Objection to the Drawings

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the drawings were objected to for failing to show "the method and system wherein the operating speed of the CPU changes according to the frequency of the operation clock." This limitation, however, is shown in Figure 6 of the present application.

According to the specification, "[t]he CPU 21 operates synchronizing with an operation clock which determines its operation speed." Specification at 6, lines 23-25. One embodiment of the part of the system which carries out this feature is depicted in Figure 6.

Referring to Figure 6, the crystal oscillator 211 generates a reference frequency signal. The reference frequency signal is passed through the Phase Locked Loop (PLL) 212, which generates a clock signal that is phase-synchronized with the frequency of the reference frequency signal. The 1/4 frequency divider 213 and the 1/16 frequency divider 214 each receive the phase synchronized clock signal output by the PLL circuit 212, and respectively output a clock signal of 1/4 and 1/16 of the input frequency.

Three signals are inputted into the selector 215: (i) the clock signal output by the PLL circuit 212, (ii) the clock signal output by the 1/4 frequency divider 213, and (iii) the clock signal output by the 1/16 frequency divider 214. The selector 215 selects one of these clock signals based on the receiving level inferential value read out from the receiving level inferential value memory section 13. The selector 215 then outputs the selected clock signal to the CPU as the CPU CLOCK signal shown in Figure 6.

Thus, Figure 6 shows "the system wherein the operating speed of the CPU changes according to the frequency of the operation clock." The Applicant respectfully asks that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn. If the Examiner still believes that Figure 6 is deficient in showing this feature, it is respectfully requested that the undersigned representative of the Applicant be contacted.

II.   Rejection under Section 102

In paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 8-9, and 14-17 were rejected as being anticipated by Oki. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent claims 1, 8, 14 and 16 each require a wireless communication device that both transmits and receives data. Oki does not disclose or suggest this limitation. Rather, the device disclosed in Oki only receives data. Since Oki neither discloses or suggests a wireless device that also transmits data, Oki does not anticipate independent claims 1, 8, 14 and 16 of the present application.

Each dependent claim of the present application includes every limitation of the claim from which it depends. Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1; claim 9 depends from claim 8; claim 15 depends from claim 14; and claim 17 depends from claim 16. Since Oki fails to anticipate claims 1, 8, 14, and 16, it also fails to anticipate their respective dependent claims.

Thus, the Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 1-3, 8-9, and 14-17 under Section 102 be withdrawn.

III.   Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

In paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Office Action, claims 5, 6, 11, and 12 were rejected as being unpatentable over Oki in view of Kondo. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Office Action must show that the prior art references, when combined, teach or suggest every claim limitation of the rejected claims. See M.P.E.P. §706.02(j), citing In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

As the Applicant previously argued in Section II, *supra*, Oki does not anticipate independent claims 1, 8, 14 and 16 of the present application, because Oki neither discloses or suggests a wireless device that both receives and transmits data. As was also previously noted, each dependent claim of the present application includes every limitation of the claim from which it depends. Since claims 5 and 6 depend from claim 1, and claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 8, Oki also fails to anticipate claims 5, 6, 11 and 12.

Kondo was not cited to cure this basic deficiency in Oki, and indeed Kondo does not. Rather, Kondo discloses certain additional features recited by claims 5, 6, 11 and 12. Regardless of whether or not Kondo recites these additional features, the combination of Oki and Kondo remains deficient, and does not disclose or suggest each and every limitation of claims 5, 6, 11, and 12. As a result, the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn.

5

IV.   Claims 4, 7, 10 and 13

The Examiner has allowed claim 7, and the Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for doing so. Although the Examiner has objected to claims 4, 10 and 13 as being dependent on a rejected base claim, he has suggested that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Again, we thank the Examiner for his suggestion, but respectfully defer acting on it until after the Examiner has rendered a decision on our request for reconsideration of the rejections of base claims 1 and 8, as set forth above.

IV.   Conclusion

In view of the arguments set forth above, we respectfully submit that each of the pending claims in the present application is in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, we request that the Examiner withdraw the outstanding rejection of the pending claims and pass this application to issue.

Dated: February 25, 2003   Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Michael J. Scheer
   Registration No.: 34,425
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
   OSHINSKY LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
41st Floor
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 835-1400
Attorneys for Applicant

Version With Markings to Show Changes Made

8. (Amended) In a wireless communication [terminal] <u>transceiver</u>, a method of controlling an operation clock for processing transmitted/received data, said method comprising the steps of:

detecting a strength of a receiving electric field; and

controlling a frequency of said operation clock based on said detected strength of said receiving electric field.

16. (Amended) A method for controlling a frequency of an operation clock in a wireless communication [terminal] <u>transceiver</u>, the method comprising:

detecting a strength of an electric field received by the wireless communication [terminal] <u>transceiver</u>; and

changing the frequency of the operation clock based on the detected strength of the received electric field.